

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-21 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Gallagher* (US 7,127,250). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections because *Gallagher* fails to teach at least one or more of the claimed features. For ease of illustration, claim 1 is discussed first.

Claim 1 calls for receiving, using a wireless controller, data transmitted from one or more wireless transmitters adapted to communicate with a plurality of mobile terminals. The Examiner argues that switch 132 of Figure 2 of *Gallagher* corresponds to the “wireless controller,” base station 128 corresponds to the “wireless transmitters,” and mobile stations 102 corresponds to the “mobile terminals” of claim 1. The Examiner, however, does not identify what “data” is received in *Gallagher* by the switch 132 (“wireless controller,” according to the Examiner).

Claim 1 further specifies receiving descriptive information associated with at least a portion of the received data from the one or more wireless transmitters. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught by *Gallagher* at col. 19, lines 9-16. See Office Action, p 2. The cited paragraph describes that a mobile station 102 (“mobile terminal” of claim 1, according to the Examiner) transmits a request message to a base station 128, which then relays an IBSAP message to the switch 132 (“wireless controller,” according to the Examiner). The IBSAP message contains mobile station identification, which is used by the controller 132 to look up the mobile station’s 102 record in the controller 132. The Examiner does not identify specifically what “descriptive information” is received in *Gallagher*. Because the only thing received by the switch 132 in the passage cited by the Examiner is “identification” information, it is assumed

that the Examiner contends that this “identification” information corresponds to the “descriptive information” referenced in claim 1. This identification information, however, is not associated with any data received using the wireless controller. In contrast, claim 1 specifies that the descriptive information is associated with at least a portion of the received data (i.e., data received using the wireless controller in the first claimed step). As such, *Gallagher* at least fails to teach receiving descriptive information associated with at least a portion of the received data.

Additionally, *Gallagher* also does not teach the last feature of claim 1, which calls for providing the received data and the associated descriptive information to a port interface associated with the wireless controller. The Examiner argues that *Gallagher* teaches this feature at col. 7, lines 31-40. This passage, however, generally describes that the switch 132 can operate in the context of a GSM network, and does not describe providing the descriptive information (that is associated with the received data) to the port.

For the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable. Moreover, for at least one or more of the reasons, independent claims 7, 14, and 21 (and including any claims depending therefrom) are allowable.

The Office Action suffers other shortcomings as well. For example, claim 2 calls for encapsulating the descriptive information with the data in a packet and providing the encapsulated packet to the port interface. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught by *Gallagher* at col. 7, lines 43-47. *See* Office Action, p. 3. This cited passage describes how switch 132 interconnects with various networks, such as UMTS and CDMA networks. However, the cited passage is wholly silent regarding the encapsulation of any descriptive information with the data in a packet for delivery to the port interface. For at least this reason, claim 2 is allowable.

Other claims are allowable over *Gallagher* as well. Consider, for example, claim 4, which calls for receiving the descriptive information comprises receiving the descriptive information encapsulated with the data in a packet, wherein the descriptive information comprises at least one high resolution timestamp associated with the data and channel information associated with the transmission of the data, wherein the channel information includes at least one of signal quality and relative signal strength index. The Examiner argues that this feature is taught at col. 16, lines 7-11 of *Gallagher*. This cited passage does not describe encapsulating any descriptive information and it does not describe where that information is either high resolution timestamp or channel information relating to signal quality or strength index. Instead, the cited passage describes the attachment/detachment message flows in the normal mode when the mobile station 102 re-enters a network coverage area. For at least this reason, claim 4 is allowable. Similarly, the other claims are allowable in view of the features recited therein.

Arguments with respect to other dependent claims have been noted. However, in view of the aforementioned arguments, these arguments are moot and, therefore, not specifically addressed. To the extent that characterizations of the prior art references or Applicants' claimed subject matter are not specifically addressed, it is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to such characterization.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4064 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Date: May 8, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

/Ruben S. Bains/

Ruben S. Bains

Reg. No. 46,532

Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.

10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100

Houston, TX 77042

(713) 934-4064

(713) 934-7011 (Fax)

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS